United Nations A/C.3/66/SR.48

General Assembly
Sixty-sixth session
Official Records

Distr.: General
7 February 2012
Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 48th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 21 November 2011, at 3 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Haniff ..... (Malaysia)

Contents

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

Agenda item 28: Advancement of women (*continued*)

(a) Advancement of women (*continued*)

Agenda item 62: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

Agenda item 65: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

(a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

Agenda item 107: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)

Agenda item 108: International drug control (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

11-60225 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Agenda item 69: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.44/Rev.1, L.49/Rev.1, L.50/Rev.1 and L.51/Rev.1)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.56 and L.57/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.44/Rev.1: Promotion of the Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms

1. **Ms. Merchant** (Norway) said that Costa Rica and Thailand had joined the sponsors.

2. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Burkina Faso, Israel and the Niger had joined the sponsors.

3. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.44/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.49/Rev.1: National institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights.

4. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

5. **Mr. Schroeer** (Germany), introducing the draft resolution, said that Costa Rica, India, Japan, Maldives, New Zealand and Thailand had joined the sponsors. The revised version of the draft resolution contained editorial changes to paragraphs 7, 10, 16 and 18.

6. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Lebanon, Mali, the Niger, Nigeria, Panama, the Russian Federation, South Sudan, Togo, Uganda, Ukraine, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) had joined the sponsors.

7. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.49/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.50/Rev.1: International Day of the Girl

8. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

9. **Mr. Rishchynski** (Canada) speaking also on behalf of Peru and Turkey, said that the Bahamas, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Pakistan, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Togo, the United States of America and Uruguay had joined the sponsors. Establishing an International Day of the Girl Child could raise awareness of the challenges that girls faced every day and provide opportunities for them to show leadership. The draft resolution and document A/C.3/66/L.24/Rev.1, entitled The girl child, were mutually reinforcing and complementary. A number of revisions had been made to the draft text. The title had been changed to "International Day of the Girl Child", which was also reflected in paragraphs 1 and 2. In addition, the third preambular paragraph had been replaced by the following text:

> "*Recognizing* that empowerment of and investment in girls, which are critical for economic growth, the achievement of all Millennium Development Goals, including the eradication of poverty and extreme poverty, as well as the meaningful participation of girls in decisions that affect them, are key in breaking the cycle of discrimination and violence and in promoting and protecting the full and effective enjoyment of their human rights, and further recognizing that empowering girls requires their active participation in decision making processes, active support and engagement of their parents, legal guardians, families and care providers, as well as boys and men, and the wider community;".

10. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, the Czech Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, France, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Haiti, Jordan Kyrgyzstan, Liberia, Mauritius, Montenegro, the Netherlands, the Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Papua New Guinea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis,

San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, South Africa, South Sudan, Suriname, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tunisia, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America and Zambia had joined the sponsors.

11. **Mr. von Haff** (Angola), speaking in explanation of position on behalf of the Southern African Development Community (SADC), said that, instead of including the draft resolution under agenda item 69 (b), it should have been included under agenda item 65, which dealt with the promotion and protection of the rights of children. Human rights was just one of the issues that needed to be addressed with regard to girls. Biennially, SADC tabled a resolution entitled "The girl child" under the agenda item on the promotion and protection of the rights of children. The draft resolution under consideration might erroneously be seen as a parallel process to that draft resolution.

12. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.50/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.51/Rev.1: Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism

13. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

14. **Mr. De Léon Huerta** (Mexico), introducing the draft resolution, said that Austria, Costa Rica, Egypt, France, Germany, Japan, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, the United States of America and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) had joined the sponsors. The approach taken in the draft resolution would complement the work of the Human Rights Council on the same topic.

15. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Angola, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Panama, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Turkey and Ukraine had joined the sponsors.

16. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.51/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.56: Situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

17. **Ms. Ortigosa** (Uruguay) said that her delegation did not share the positions expressed by the Islamic Republic of Iran on the State of Israel and on whether or not the Holocaust was a matter of historical fact. Efforts to guarantee full human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran had fallen short. Her delegation radically disagreed with that country's refusal to cooperate with Argentine justice and with its use of the death penalty, in particular for minors, and execution by stoning.

18. Nonetheless, her country supported a human rights approach which stressed cooperation before proceeding to denunciation or confrontation. A dynamic which focused exclusively on denunciation or confrontation would be seriously limited. Uruguay had therefore abstained from voting on the draft resolution. While the invitation to the High Commissioner for Human Rights to visit the Islamic Republic of Iran was a step forward, the lengthy preparation time and delays were cause for concern. Visits by special procedures mandate holders should also be permitted.

19. **Mr. Kimura** (Japan) said that, while his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, the Government of Japan had held a human rights dialogue with the Islamic Republic of Iran earlier in the year, and appreciated the continuation of dialogue as indicative of a positive attitude. The Iranian Government should implement the 123 recommendations made as part of the universal periodic review, which it had accepted.

20. **Mr. Abdullah** (Malaysia) said that country-specific resolutions were susceptible to politicization and could detract attention from the objective of effecting positive change. His country strongly supported a non-confrontational approach, constructive and respectful dialogue and cooperation, with respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity. The Islamic Republic of Iran had recently taken steps to demonstrate its engagement with the international community on human rights issues.

21. **Mr. Khan** (Indonesia) said that politicization was counterproductive and increased misunderstanding. The negotiations over the draft resolution had been highly politicized, resulting in a lack of meaningful dialogue and cooperation.

22. **Mr. Fiallo** (Ecuador) said that such draft resolutions were not motivated by human rights concerns. Pressure on nations of the South increased divisions among States. Country-specific resolutions had been used to justify intervention in sovereign States.

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.57/Rev.1: Situation of human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic

23. **Mr. Wittig** (Germany) said that Andorra, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Cape Verde, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Senegal, Slovakia, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Vanuatu had joined the sponsors.

24. Despite repeated calls from the international community, including the United Nations and the League of Arab States, widespread human rights violations continued in the Syrian Arab Republic. The death toll was mounting, with the most recent United Nations estimates stating that more than 3,500 civilians had been killed there. Syrian authorities had refused access to the independent international commission, although such access had been mandated by the Human Rights Council.

25. It was important to support the strong and remarkable stance taken by the League of Arab States and, in particular, its efforts to bring about an immediate end to the violence. The draft resolution was a unique response to the critical events currently taking place on the ground in the Syrian Arab Republic. The initiative had substantial support from States of the Arab League.

26. **Mr. Ja'afari** (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the purpose of France, Germany and the United Kingdom in sponsoring the draft resolution was not to bolster human rights in the Syrian Arab Republic but rather to declare a political, media and diplomatic war on his country.

27. He doubted that the suffering of millions of civilians in his country owing to unilateral economic sanctions had contributed to the reinforcement of human rights. He also doubted that funding and arming opposition groups and hosting their leaders in conferences in the capital cities of some of the sponsors, at which there had been calls for armed rebellion and the overthrow of the Syrian Government, served the cause of human rights.

28. Some of the sponsors of the draft resolution had invaded and occupied other Member States, killing millions of their citizens. Heads of State and Ministers for Foreign Affairs of some of the sponsors had made public statements which had the effect of interfering in the internal affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic. Lies had been told at the United Nations regarding civilian casualty figures in his country. Many of the sponsors supported secret prisons and mounting human rights violations, including torture, in Iraq, Afghanistan and Libya. France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America still had colonies and hundreds of military bases around the world.

29. The Western States that had sponsored the draft resolution turned a blind eye to the Israeli occupation of Arab territories, including the occupied Syrian Golan. They were silent regarding Israeli massacres of Arabs and the violation of the right to Palestinian self-determination. Threats by some countries to veto the Palestinian application for full membership in the United Nations did not bolster human rights.

30. Other actions by some of the sponsors that neither strengthened nor protected human rights included discrimination against Roma people in Germany and their eviction to Kosovo; the demolition of housing units in France and the eviction of thousands of Roma and related groups to Bulgaria and Romania; and encouragement and protection of Islamophobia. The ultimate goal of the sponsors was to put the United Nations out of existence, just as European nations had put the League of Nations out of existence in order to satisfy their colonial greed and their desire to plunder the wealth of the developing world.

31. Three of the European sponsors had caused bloody world wars resulting in the deaths of 100 million people. Millions of people had served as cannon fodder in those wars, including people from former colonies, the Syrian Arab Republic among them. Those European States oppressed their Arab Muslim citizens and guests, prevented them from constructing mosques and spread Islamophobia. Yet they spoke about human rights as if they were moral authorities. No European power had ever apologized

for the dark history of colonialism and slavery, nor had any country paid reparations to the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America for the crimes committed against them.

32. The draft resolution would more appropriately be entitled "The illness of animosity towards the Syrian Arab Republic." Those suffering from that illness should be referred to a specialized hospital for treatment rather than being permitted to engage in a futile quest to infect the rest of the Member States. Despite the negativity, the Syrian Arab Republic would continue to move ahead with its political and other reforms, which enjoyed a broad consensus in the country.

Agenda item 28: Advancement of women (*continued*)

(a) Advancement of women (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.18/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.18/Rev.1: Violence against women migrant workers

33. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

34. **Ms. Werdaningtyas** (Indonesia), introducing the draft resolution also on behalf of the Philippines, said that the Comoros, the Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ecuador, El Salvador, Haiti, Mali, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Senegal, Seychelles, Timor-Leste and the United Republic of Tanzania had joined the sponsors. He pointed out a number of minor revisions to the text to reflect the language that had been agreed upon.

35. Globalization had created many employment opportunities outside of workers' countries of origin. There had been some 214 million international migrant workers in 2010, of whom 49 per cent had been women. While such employment opportunities could be empowering, they could also have adverse consequences. Women's vulnerability to inhuman treatment, violence and abuse in the workplace had numerous causes.

36. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burkina Faso, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Jamaica, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Liberia, Mozambique, Namibia, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors.

37. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.18/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

38. **The Chair**, in accordance with General Assembly decision 55/488, suggested that the Committee should take note of the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Special Rapporteur on violence against women (A/66/215).

39. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 62: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.69/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.69/Rev.1: Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa

40. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

41. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Brazil, Canada, the Central African Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Francia, Germany, Georgia, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America had joined the sponsors.

42. **Ms. Sulimani** (Sierra Leone), speaking on behalf of the African Group, said that Spain had joined the sponsors. African countries and the international community were concerned about the increase in the number of refugees in Africa. While the refugee population in Africa had decreased slightly during 2010, that trend had been reversed in sub-Saharan Africa in 2011.

43. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.69/Rev.1 was adopted.*

Agenda item 65: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

(a) Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.22/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.22/ Rev.1: Strengthening collaboration on child protection within the United Nations system

44. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

45. **Mr. Srivali** (Thailand), introducing the draft resolution, said that Algeria, Belize, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, the Central African Republic, Ecuador, Guinea-Bissau, Indonesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Nepal, Nicaragua, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Senegal, the Sudan, Tajikistan and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors.

46. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritania, Namibia, South Sudan and Swaziland had also joined the sponsors.

47. **Mr. Abdullah** (Malaysia), speaking on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), said that the member States of ASEAN firmly believed that the draft resolution was a milestone in seeking organizational improvement to protect children worldwide. Further strengthening collaboration within the United Nations was logical and necessary in light of new developments around the world. In 2010, in a historic step, ASEAN had established a Commission on the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Women and Children.

The meeting was suspended at 4:10 p.m. and resumed at 4:15 p.m.

48. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.22/Rev.1 was adopted.*

49. **Mr. Sammis** (United States of America) said that his delegation was concerned that the draft resolution infringed on the prerogatives of other United Nations bodies and on the independence of mandate holders. With regard to paragraph 2, the United States reaffirmed its confidence in the relevant actors, rejecting any interpretation that indicated lack of confidence in them or that jeopardized the independence of their work.

50. The lead sponsors had provided assurances that the word "continue" in paragraph 2 related to both the phrase "to exercise their functions in a fully independent manner" as well as the phrase "to act in full observance of their respective mandates." That was the interpretation of the United States. The wording was, at best, infelicitous and, in future, should be replaced with a less ambiguous formulation.

51. The language in the sixth preambular paragraph reaffirming the role of the General Assembly in the United Nations child protection system ignored the important work of other United Nations bodies. The work of the General Assembly should not be given precedence over that of other United Nations bodies that were independent of the General Assembly. The United States applauded the important work of the relevant actors who made invaluable contributions to the well-being of children. Child protection was often broader than protection of the rights of the child.

52. Lastly, the report requested in paragraph 4 would duplicate other work and must not be interpreted to permit State interference in the work of the relevant actors. Independence and impartiality were the foundation of the work of the mandate holders for the rights of the child and child protection.

53. **Ms. Merchant** (Norway), speaking also on behalf of Liechtenstein and Switzerland, said that work on child protection was widely regarded as a United Nations success story. There was no need for the General Assembly to take any initiatives regarding information sharing among United Nations child rights actors. Such initiatives could challenge and undermine the independence of the relevant mandate holders. There was a concern that, as worded, the draft resolution could call into question whether the relevant United Nations actors had been observing their mandates. That was an inappropriate message to send.

54. **Ms. Li Xiaomei** (China) said that the draft resolution was positive and conducive to helping the relevant United Nations actors do a better job to strengthen compliance with child protection standards.

55. **Ms. Grabianowska** (Poland), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that there were serious concerns regarding the text and aim of the draft resolution and that the added value of the text remained unclear. Great progress had been made in children's rights thanks to the United Nations actors.

56. It was important for all Member States to respect the work of all mandate holders and allow them to work independently without pressure or intimidation. The word "continue" in paragraph 2 was understood to refer to the rest of the sentence in its entirety. The report requested of the Secretary-General in paragraph 4 was not an evaluation mechanism but rather an opportunity to demonstrate effective collaboration among child protection actors.

57. **Ms. Murillo Ruin** (Costa Rica) said that the language of the draft resolution could not be interpreted in a way which was prejudicial to the position of the Secretary-General.

58. **Mr. Butt** (Pakistan) said that the language of the draft resolution was very appropriate and reflected the expectations of the general membership with regard to the relevant mandate holders. The controversy raised earlier had been completely unnecessary. All mandate holders must adhere fully to their mandates. That was what the Member States expected of them.

59. **Mr. Tagle** (Chile) said that the draft resolution in no way limited the independence of the mandate holders. Their impartiality was extremely important, and they would certainly continue along those lines.

Agenda item 107: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.15/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.15/Rev.1: Strengthening the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme, in particular its technical cooperation capacity

60. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

61. **Mr. Mogini** (Italy) said that Dominica had joined the sponsors. Transnational organized crime jeopardized security, obstructed the functioning of public institutions, undermined respect for human rights and harmed legitimate economic activities. It operated as a global business which sought to reap big profits. Curbing its financial power would affect its raison d'être. Targeting huge illegal assets accumulated by criminals around the world must be a major thrust of international cooperation.

62. New elements of the draft resolution included asset recovery and a reference to the return of illicitly acquired assets to countries of origin, implementation of a global plan of action on human trafficking and launch of the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Victims of Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children.

63. New language focused on the efforts of the Secretary-General to develop an effective and comprehensive approach to transnational organized crime and drug trafficking; the need for a comprehensive and integrated approach to crime prevention and criminal justice reform at the national and regional levels; the need to strengthen the capacity of criminal justice systems to investigate and prosecute all forms of crime while protecting defendants' human rights and fundamental freedoms; and the successful outcome of the recent fourth session of the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption, held in Marrakesh.

64. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Andorra, Cape Verde, the Central African Republic, the Comoros, Ecuador, Kenya, Nicaragua, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, South Sudan, Tunisia, Zambia and Zimbabwe had joined the sponsors.

65. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.15/Rev.1 was adopted.*

66. **Ms. Löw** (Switzerland) said that regrettably, delegations had been unable to agree on a direct reference to the task force on transnational organized crime and drug trafficking created earlier in the year at the initiative of the Secretary-General.

67. **Ms. Calcinari Van Der Velde** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation had concerns regarding imprecise statements in the eleventh, fourteenth and sixteenth preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution that were not substantiated by legal instruments in the area. Fighting transnational organized crime would not have an impact on international peace and security. Her country did not recognize systematic links between transnational organized crime, gun trafficking and terrorist activities. Each type of crime had different motivations, and automatically linking them violated norms of due process and the presumption of innocence. Such links should be analyzed on a case-by-case basis.

68. There was no generally accepted definition of terrorism, including State terrorism, so it was not possible to discuss shared responsibility in combating

terrorism. The sixteenth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution ran counter to the Bangkok Declaration on Synergies and Responses: Strategic Alliances in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice with regard to international cooperation in combating transnational crime. Moreover, terrorism should be addressed in the Sixth Committee.

69. **The Chair** suggested, in accordance with General Assembly decision 55/488, that the Committee should take note of the report of the Secretary-General on the follow-up to the Twelfth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (A/66/91) and the note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime on its fifth session (A/66/92).

70. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 108: International drug control (*continued*) (A/C.3/66/L.16/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.16/Rev.1: International cooperation against the world drug problem

71. **The Chair** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

72. **Mr. De Léon Huerta** (Mexico) said that Afghanistan, Algeria, Austria, the Bahamas, Belize, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominica, France, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Poland, Portugal, Singapore, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland had joined the sponsors. The draft resolution had been updated by mentioning progress achieved during the past year in the Commission on Narcotic Drugs.

73. **Mr. Gustafik** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Ecuador, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Jamaica, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mali, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, the Philippines, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, Vanuatu and Zambia had joined the sponsors.

74. *Draft resolution A/C.3/66/L.16/Rev.1 was adopted.*

75. **Ms. Calcinari Van Der Velde** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that efforts to reduce illicit drugs crops fell far short of the objectives set forth in the relevant international conventions. Illicit drug production had increased tremendously in recent years, which had had a major impact on transit countries. Her delegation had reservations with regard to paragraphs 18 and 19 of the draft resolution. It did not recognize systematic links between illicit drug trafficking and other types of transnational international crime, each of which had different motives and patterns. Such automatic linking ran counter to due process and the presumption of innocence. Cooperation should not be limited to technical and financial assistance and should be carried out with full respect for non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States and respect for sovereignty.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.